



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,216	07/20/2001	Sandra L. Schneider	10007172-1	2697

7590 10/18/2005  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
EBRAHIMI DEHKORDY, SAEID	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/910,216

**Applicant(s)**

SCHNEIDER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Saeid Ebrahimi-dehKordy

**Art Unit**

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/30/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **Response to Amendment**

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant basic argument is Web page is not described as being provided via a restricted Web site, this argument has been repeated by the applicant for all the independent claims 1,7,13 and 16 and also on dependent claim 5, it is also argued that the brand printer brand name is not present.

Examiner points out that the restrictiveness of the web page is determined by entering the specific indicia of the machine 10, the printer, such as consumable components and reconfigurable parts and variety of model numbers, part numbers, data of manufacturer etc as defined by Hayward et al (note column 4 lines 32-42) now on (column 6 lines 37-54) where the browser is launched based on the indicia of the printer 10 by using the [www.manufacturer.com/product/xxx](http://www.manufacturer.com/product/xxx) where the "product" is the printer indicia as mentioned above the Web site above is therefor restrictive because only the devices with the exact indicia such as printer 10 could access the Web site through the browser.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayward et al (U.S. patent 6,798,997) in view of Lee (U.S. patent 6,539,867)

**Regarding claim 1 and 16** Hayward et al disclose: A method comprising: determining if the new replaceable component has a particular brand name (please note column 4 lines 32-39 where the part number or serial number or manufacturer is obtained also note column 4 lines 32-42 where the indicia is including the model number of the printer 10) and providing a link to a restricted web site that is restricted to users of products having the particular brand name if the new replaceable component is determined to have the particular brand name (please note column 7 lines 60-63 where the browser is launched when the indicia of the component is determined to be a certain brand which would be in the indicia also note column 6 lines 37-52 where the Web page is being launched based on the restrictive information regarding the printer 10 such as the indicia of the printer namely the printer model or number column 4 lines 32-42) However Hayward et al don't disclose: detecting when a new replaceable component is installed into a printing device. On the other hand Lee discloses: detecting when a new replaceable component is installed into a printing device (please note column 3 lines 61-65 where the sensor is going to sense or detect whether the new part is installed in the printer). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to modify Hayward et al's invention according to the teaching of Lee, where Lee teaches the way that the new part installed in the printer could be detected for the purpose of having it being replaced.

**Regarding claim 2** Hayward et al disclose: The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising providing a link to an unrestricted web site that is accessible to users of products having the particular brand name and users of products not having the

Art Unit: 2626

particular name brand (please note column 5 lines 35-38 where depending on the software and user input automatically connects the user to a part supplier, manufacture, or a consumable item vendor).

**Regarding claim 3** Hayward et al disclose: The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the determining if the new replaceable component has a particular brand name further comprises retrieving a brand identifier from component memory integrated with the new replaceable component (please note column 6 lines 29-34).

**Regarding claim 4 and 10** Hayward et al disclose: The method as recited in claim 3, wherein the component memory further comprises radio frequency identification (RFID) memory (please note column 9 lines 56-65).

**Regarding claim 5** Hayward et al disclose: The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the providing a link to a restricted web site further comprises providing a link to a restricted web site via a dedicated web browser that can only be used to access the restricted web site (please note column 6 lines 49-53).

**Regarding claim 6** Hayward et al disclose: The method as recited in claim 1, wherein: the printing device is a laser printer and the replaceable component is a laser printer toner cartridge (please note column 9 lines 38-42).

**Regarding claim 7** Hayward et al disclose: A printing device, comprising: a replaceable component (toner cartridge, column 5 lines 6-9 where the consumable replacement is done) a detector configured to detect when the replaceable component is installed in the printing device (note Lee, column 3 lines 61-65 where the sensor is going to sense or detect whether the new part is installed in the printer) means for identifying a brand

Art Unit: 2626

name of the replaceable component installed in the printer device (note Hayward et al, column 4 lines 32-42 where indicia is used to identify the consumable components and reconfigurable parts) a web browser configured to access a restricted web site that is restricted to users of replaceable components having a particular brand name (please note column 7 lines 60-67 where the browser is launched based on the component indicia which is imprinted on the component) and wherein the web browser is configured to access the restricted web site only if the brand name of the replaceable component is identified as being a replaceable component having the particular name brand (please note Fig.7 column 7 lines 60-67 and specifically lines 60-63 where the browser gets launched based on the indicia of the component other wise if the web site is not restricted then column lines 19-46 where the specific information such as the model, product and serial number have been presented and on column 6 lines 38-60 where the browser of the manufacturer's or the browser of the vendor is displayed based on the format www.manufacturer.com/product/xxx as explained on claim 1).

**Regarding claim 8** Hayward et al disclose: The printing device as recited in claim 7, wherein the restricted Web browser is a dedicated web browser that can only access the restricted web site (please note column 7 lines 60-63 where the browser is launched when the indicia of the component is determined to be a certain brand which would be in the indicia) and further comprising a general web browser that is configured to provide access to one or more unrestricted web sites to users of products not having the particular brand name (please note column lines 19-46 where the specific information such as the model, product and serial number have been presented and on

Art Unit: 2626

column 6 lines 38-60 where the browser of the manufacturer's or the browser of the vendor is displayed based on the format www.manufacturer.com/product/xxx).

**Regarding claim 11** Hayward et al disclose: The printing device as recited in claim 7, wherein the replaceable component further comprises a laser printer toner cartridge (please note column 9 lines 38-42).

**Regarding claim 12** Hayward et al disclose: The printing device as recited in claim 7, wherein the replaceable component further comprises an ink jet printer ink cartridge (please note column 9 lines 40-42).

**Regarding claim 13** Hayward et al disclose: A printing device replaceable component (toner cartridge, column 5 lines 6-9 where the consumable replacement is done) comprising: a housing (please note column 2 lines 51-58) a toner supply (please note column 9 lines 40-42) component memory that stores a brand identifier (please note column 4 lines 46-55) to determine whether the replaceable component has a particular brand name which the printing device associates with a restricted Web site (note column 6 lines 38-52 and column 4 lines 32-42 as explained in claim 1) the printing device providing access to a restricted Web browser configured to access the restricted Web site when the printing device determines that the replaceable component *has the* particular brand name (note column 4 lines 32-42 where indicia is determining the brand or model of the printer, consumable components, reconfigurable parts, etc.)

However Hayward et al don't disclose: and wherein a printing device in which the replaceable component is installed verifies the brand identifier. On the other hand Lee discloses: and wherein the brand identifier is verified by a printing device in which the

Art Unit: 2626

replaceable component is installed (please note column 3 lines 61-65 where the sensor is going to sense or detect whether the new part is installed in the printer).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention to modify Hayward et al's invention according to the teaching of Lee, where Lee teaches the way that the new part installed in the printer could be detected for the purpose of having it being replaced.

**Regarding claim 14** Hayward et al disclose: The printing device replaceable component as recited in claim 13, wherein the brand identifier can be used to uniquely identify a brand name of the replaceable component (please note column 4 lines 32-42).

**Regarding claim 15** Hayward et al disclose: The printing device replaceable component as recited in claim 13, wherein the restricted website is restricted to users of printing devices that have a particular brand name (please note Fig.7 column 7 lines 60-67 and specifically lines 60-63 where the browser gets launched based on the indicia of the component other wise if the web site is not restricted then column lines 19-46 where the specific information such as the model, product and serial number have been presented and on column 6 lines 38-60 where the browser of the manufacturer's or the browser of the vendor is displayed based on the format www.manufacturer.com/product/xxx).

**Regarding claim 17** Hayward et al disclose: The one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 16, further comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following additional step: providing access to one or more unrestricted web sites, whether or not the component is the particular brand of component (please note column 4 lines 32-42 where the sensing indicia is



Art Unit: 2626

determining the consumable components, reconfigurable parts, etc. also column 6 lines 29-34).

**Regarding claim 18** Hayward et al disclose: The one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 16, further comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following additional step: identifying a universal resource locator (URL) for the restricted web site (please note column 7 lines 54-65).

**Regarding claim 19** Hayward et al disclose: The one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 16, wherein the component is a replaceable component (please note column 5 lines 6-9).

**Regarding claim 20** Hayward et al disclose: The one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 16, wherein the one or more computer-readable media are contained in a printer (note column 6 lines 60-63).

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

3. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 9 represents a new limitation which is the replaceable component further comprises an interrogator configured to read a brand identifier stored in the component memory integrated with the replaceable component.

### **Contact Information**

Art Unit: 2626

- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy* whose telephone number is (571) 272-7462.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams, can be reached at (571) 272-7471.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**Or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9306, or (703) 308-9052 (for **formal** communications; please mark  
"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")


**Or:**

(703) 306-5406 (for **informal** or **draft** communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

**Hand delivered responses** should be brought to Knox building on 501 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Saeid Ebrahimi-Dehkordy  
Patent Examiner  
Group Art Unit 2626  
October 13, 2005



  
KIMBERLY WILLIAMS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER